JUL 28 1986

Y 4 N16 : 99-1-4

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

ORIGINAL

54

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1985

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

SCNAC-99-1-4

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

61-096 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CDD

I

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

(99th Congress)

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., Florida
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
GENE CHAPPIE, California
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOSEPH J. DioGUARDI, New York
MICHAEL L. STRANG, Colorado
JOHN G. ROWLAND, Connecticut

COMMITTEE STAFF

JOHN T. CUSACK, *Chief of Staff*
ELLIOTT A. BROWN, *Minority Staff Director*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1985

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:17 a.m., in room B-318, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Charles B. Rangel presiding.

Present: Representatives Charles B. Rangel, Peter W. Rodino, James H. Scheuer, Edolphus Towns, Benjamin A. Gilman, E. Clay Shaw, and John G. Rowland.

Staff present: John T. Cusack, chief of staff and Elliott A. Brown, minority staff director.

Mr. RANGEL. The select committee would open up this hearing. We want to thank Secretary Jon Thomas for being with us. But I want to take advantage of the presence of Peter Rodino who has been a leader in this struggle long before Ben Gilman and I ever came to the Congress. And who I can publicly state without whose support this committee would not be in existence.

And I yield to him for the purpose of any statement he would want to make.

Mr. RODINO. Well, thank you very much Mr. Chairman and members. I personally don't want to make this an Alphonse/Gaston act. But nevertheless, I think it's necessary to say that you, Mr. Chairman, along with your members have shown the kind of awareness, the kind of consciousness of this problem that has really kept all of us on our toes.

And it's for that reason that I've strongly endorsed the continuance of the select committee's activities. And notwithstanding the fact that there has been and had been in the past a great deal of skepticism as to what a select committee might be able to accomplish, since it did not possess authorizing authority in the area of legislation.

I think that you have done a job in continuing to focus on it in the various visits that you've made to the various countries that have been affected. And notwithstanding that some people refer to them as junkets, I think they're the kinds of junkets, if you will, that really benefited the kind of activity that I think we're interested in continuing.

Let me say very briefly that I just led a delegation of the Judiciary Committee. And you know we complement the work of this committee because we have legislative authority in our committee to act. And I believe that we found it important after some need was shown to get out there and get out there ourselves.

And while Congressman Hughes, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, has been also at this committee, visiting and sharing ideas and common concerns with the heads of other countries who are responsible in this area, I thought that this time I would go along.

And I visited the various countries that are deeply affected with this problem. And without in any way prolonging what I have to say, let me say that all I could come back with is a determined effort to do more than we have done.

And to say to you, Mr. Thomas, that the job that is ours to do is indeed a big one. The problem as I see it is such that unless we act with a determination to make this matter one that stands in highest priority in our foreign policy agenda, I don't think that the countries that are affected and that are presently source countries are going to be aware of how deeply we really feel.

I am of course encouraged when I do hear from you as I do hear from you in some letters that I've had from the State Department, that there is a greater consciousness on the part of our Department of State that there is a need to bring this threat if you will of the kinds of sanctions that are in our statutes. I think that's important to do, and I know that you need that backup as well. But I can say though that in the various countries that I have visited where I stressed to the people who are responsible for the operations, whether it was in Thailand, whether it was in Pakistan, whether it was in Hong Kong or whatever other countries, and in Burma, I stressed a need for this kind of international cooperation because without that, without effective international cooperation, we're not going to stamp out this plague.

Indeed, the Chinese have referred to it as a plague. Bi Pong, the Vice Premiere who I spoke with, said that they saw that as the greatest threat in the past. And, of course, now that they begin to feel that something is happening as well over there, they are mustering all their efforts.

And I think that all I can conclude really is to say that we've got one job to do. And I'm hopeful that the State Department and all that it can bring to bear in this area will actually speak out with greater and greater force, because I think that's the only way these other countries will be impressed.

And Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you. I'm going to file a full report with the committee so that you know just what we've been able to at least see and what we think we ought to do in order to more effectively deal with the problem. Thank you very much.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you Mr. Chairman. And I think that when we combine our reports that they will not be in conflict with the findings of the State Department. And perhaps then we should have an informal meeting with State to see whether we can avoid a conflict between legislative action and foreign policy, which we have stated over and over that we believe that the initiative should come from the executive branch.

Mr. RODINO. If you would yield for just one other observation. And maybe because my name is Rodino I might have been considered as having mentioned this or wanting to mention it, because it refers to Italy.

But as you know Mr. Thomas, I was unable to meet with you there when the group did meet you. But we did have our meeting with the Minister of the Interior, Scalfaro.

And I must say if there's an example of the kind of cooperation that really is working, it's the kind of cooperation that's been worked out between Italy and the United States in dealing with this problem.

And the Minister of the Interior met us along with his deputies. And for about an hour and 45 minutes, we had an honest to goodness discussion about this and an exchange that was really worthwhile. And I of course as you know, because you've been there and you've talked with them, I want to commend the initiative of our Government in having reached out there and brought about this kind of cooperation.

And I think if it works with a lot of other countries like that maybe we'll get somewhere.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I ask the committee's unanimous consent to put my opening statement in the record without objection.

[Mr. Rangel's opening statement appears on p. 25.]

I'd like to report while the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is here just briefly on our trip to seven countries in some 17 days. And I'd like to say before we hear from the Secretary that in no country did we find that the Secretary's presence has not been felt or that our country's position has not been explained.

And we felt proud of the relationship that did exist through your efforts in every country that we visited. It was unfortunate that in some countries that we went that our ambassador was not there. But certainly where we did find—or there was a new Ambassador there.

But where we did find Ambassadors, especially in Peru, that understood the problem, we felt proud that our country was more than just adequately represented. And that the concerns of the American people and the Congress had been expressed to these heads of state.

I'd just like to say that I agree with Chairman Rodino that we hope that we can express to the executive branch in some way that is compatible with the bipartisan spirit in which this committee operates what we think is a need for the Secretary and the President to show that at that level there is the same concern as you have so professionally expressed on the level which you so well represent the interests of the United States.

And we appreciate the fact that you should compliment the committee on it's trip. And this is especially appreciated by the Chair and it's members since some of the sanctions that we have legislated were not favored by the State Department.

But we can say that they have been understood by the members of the legislative bodies as well as the executive in every country that we have gone to, that indeed we have a constituency that we have to respond to.

And Mr. Secretary, the question remains, are we going to be put in the position where we force politically to over-respond and undo some of the agreements or some of at least the plans that are projected by the State Department?

I don't want to have it appear for the record that either the Congress or the executive branch have really been successful in explaining the dangers of narcotic production in our missions case coca production, that we are responsible for this newly found or at least this concern that has been demonstrated by every chief of state that we had an opportunity to talk with. And we did talk with six out of the seven that we visited.

But the fear that exists with the leaders of these countries that democracy as we know it is being jeopardized because of the increase in narcotic trafficking, has allowed each of us to leave these countries knowing that they understand the impact of the problem.

The fact that the countries of Peru and Bolivia, where they are faced with shattering economies because of the deficit that the newly elected Presidents have inherited, singled out the question of narcotics and narcotics control in their inaugural addresses, knowing that this would economically impact on the very people that they have pledged themselves to improve the quality of life, shows and indicates to all the committee members that they are prepared to take the political risks that even some of our own governments have not been prepared to take closer to the United States.

It is hard for us to understand how in a great country of Colombia, assassinations can take place, judges are so threatened with their own personal safety that even the prosecution of drug traffickers have been given up by the civilian authorities and transferred to the military authorities just to have trials.

But I think the most persuasive thing that we found in our mission Mr. Secretary, was the fact that countries that have not been contaminated with the production of coca but yet realize the potential of this realizing in their countries and their willingness to disregard the sensitive sovereign border protections that they have in the past to cooperate with countries to get at the very core of the problem that they know now is regional rather than just local impressed us. And we certainly hope that in some way we can publicly express our willingness to cooperate with them in this effort because every country indicated that their resources may restrict them from going as far as they would want to.

I conclude by saying Mr. Secretary that in one of these countries the President told us that they can understand our concern with what is going on in Central America, but indicated that as far as Latin America is concerned, as far as South America is concerned, that that is not the main arena.

And while he was not critical of that policy and respected the fact that we represented our country, he made it abundantly clear that he would like to see the type of attention paid to the impact that narcotic traffickers are having on their governments that we have played on the Communist activity in Central America.

We do hope that in the course of the testimony that you are going to give us this morning that you might avoid lengthy questioning by the members in trying to assure us that the President and the Secretary are prepared to state publicly their support for existing legislation which has sanctions in it.

But more importantly to express what you have so adequately expressed, the concerns of the State Department to heads of government to make it abundantly clear that it comes from the high-

est possible source. And that we have properly identified the priority that this international problem deserves.

The chair yields to Ben Gilman, who without his leadership and support and more partisan view would be taken by the Chair and by some of the members on this side. But it is not our intention to embarrass or to make political points, but to try to find some way to have a better working relationship between the parties and the branches of Government.

Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you Mr. Chairman. And I certainly want to welcome the chairman of the Judiciary Committee today, Mr. Rodino, who has added so much to the work of this committee. And we certainly welcome our assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thomas, and his assistants, Ms. Wrobleski and Mr. Dion.

It's a great pleasure to see Ceasar Bernal here, who is spending so much time with us in Latin America and on our recent trip in Colombia, and has done such good work in the operations of the INM. And we hope that he is able to continue that new work while he is back here in Washington.

We regret he has pulled out of the field, but I am sure that he will provide his expertise now for many other areas of work.

Mr. Chairman, I want to again commend you and our whole staff for arranging an excellent visit to Latin America. I think that our recent visit there came away with a good deal of worthwhile endeavors. There was some good news and some bad news.

The bad news was that the narcotics production is still escalating and it is coming out of there by the tons, more now than ever before. And that more will be entering our Nation in the coming year than ever before.

The good news of course is that we have some new leaders in the emerging democracies that have expressed some very strong commitments to us. We see some new signs of optimism in the programs that both Colombia and Ecuador have undertaken. Colombia for the work they are doing in marijuana, and Ecuador in tightening up their enforcement efforts to make certain that they don't expand into the kind of production, the kind of trafficking that is going on in their neighboring countries.

We found too that in Peru, the new president, President Garcia, expressing to us a very firm commitment to try to weed out corruption in his government and to undertake some effective steps. So there was some very encouraging responses that we received to our entreaties to those leaders to try to take some more effective measures in decreasing production and enhancing enforcement efforts.

This week in the Congress in our Foreign Affairs Committee, and I haven't had an opportunity to report to our chairman. But I'd like to state it to our staff and to our members here that we have had an opportunity to meet with several delegations.

Our Select Committee met with a delegation from Argentina, some of the deputatos, who were here and expressed a need for closer cooperation and recognized that they do have a leadership role as we had stressed in meeting with the president of Argentina. We were pleased that Argentina had established recently a narcotics commission at the executive branch.

But the legislators in meeting with us went away with a feeling that they would like to establish a narcotics committee in their own legislature, in their own parliament. Just as we had found in many of the other governments in Latin America when we met with them, they expressed an interest in developing their own kind of committees, fashioned somewhat after the Select Committee. And we certainly encouraged that and we hoped that we could establish some liaison with all of them, and we intend to pursue that.

But Mr. Chairman we also met this week in the Foreign Affairs Committee with the opposition leader of the government of Spain. And when I broached with him the reports that we heard of the beginnings of a greater amount of transitting of narcotics trafficking from Argentina, from Latin America into Spain, he responded with a great deal of concern, and it surprised me that he made the statement that narcotics today in Spain is one of their biggest problems. Not only in transitting and trafficking but in abuse.

And they have awakened to the problem and are beginning to recognize that they have to take some very firm steps. Reports that we were just beginning to hear about increased trafficking apparently struck home to a greater extent within their own government.

We met too this week with the Prime Minister of Denmark along with some of his staff of people. And when I broached the subject of narcotics with the Prime Minister of Denmark again we had the response that this is one of the more critical problems in their own country.

And as we know in Copenhagen they even have a little autonomous village within the city where they allow narcotics trafficking and narcotics abuse to take place without any interference. And as one of our colleagues reminded the Prime Minister that this is a cancer on the face of the Danish Government. And it was our hope that they would take some strenuous efforts to remove that sore in their involvement.

But they did recognize how serious a problem it has become and how important it was for them to do some things in the narcotics effort, again opening the door for some further cooperative efforts with our own country.

We met too this week with the leaders of the Romanian Government, the head of their legislative body. And they too recognized the transitting problems going through their government and were beginning to take some steps.

So I point this out to just underscore the fact that the European Continent as well as the Latin American continent is beginning to wake up to the problem and the need for doing a great deal more.

We heard too from some of our delegates to the IPU conference in Ottawa last week. And I was pleased to learn that narcotics was raised for the first time at the IPU meeting and that a resolution was adopted. I haven't seen that resolution yet. But as you and I know we have been trying to encourage international bodies and inter-parliamentary groups in Mexico and in Vienna and elsewhere to tackle this problem.

We met too this week with the Secretary General of the United Nations in our Foreign Affairs meetings. And he reminded us that in 1987 that we are going to be having an international conference

on narcotics sponsored by the United Nations. And we stressed the fact that we want to take an active role in that international conference.

And I hope that Mr. Secretary we are going to be well prepared for that conference. Just this morning we had a reminder in our Foreign Affairs Committee meeting how sometimes we go to these international meetings not well prepared, not as well prepared as we should be, and not with the kind of backup staff that is needed so many times in these international conferences.

So I would hope that we would give a great deal of attention to that forthcoming conference. We look forward to your comments today, Mr. Thomas.

I was pleased to see your report come into our recent initiative in Latin America. I think there is so much more that we can and should be doing in that area. We recognize how little attention we had been giving to those problems in Latin America as our chairman reminded us as we focused attention on Central America and sometimes neglecting the rest of the continent.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

[Statement of Mr. Gilman appears on p. 29.]

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you Mr. Gilman. The Chair welcomes the presence of Congressman Jim Scheuer, one of the more informed members of Congress and certainly of this committee. As well as Ed Towns, who——

Yes, I yield.

Mr. SCHEUER. I just wanted to say Mr. Chairman that it is long past the hour of 10 and I hope that we can get on with hearing the witnesses. And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANGEL. The chair also likes to acknowledge the presence of Ed Towns who made many contributions during our 17 day trip. But I think would be remembered by asking just one question as the newly appointed Attorney General of Columbia was pointing out the thousands of arrests that they have made with their aggressive attack on international drug trafficking. And Ed Towns asked one question, how many convictions have you had. And that ended that because there was no relationship between convictions and arrests.

Mr. Secretary, we are pleased to hear from you. We have your detailed statement. And you can summarize or you can proceed as you see fit. And the chair also recognizes the presence of Ms. Wrobleski as well as newly appointed Mr. Dion. And we welcome you to the committee.

Secretary Thomas.

TESTIMONY OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY JON R. THOMAS, BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS MATTERS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, ACCOMPANIED BY MARK DION, AND ANN WROBLESKI

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. Also my regards to Judiciary Committee Chairman Rodino.

When I was in Rome following the United Nations congress on crime prevention I would like to report to this committee that unlike 5 years ago when the U.N. crime commission met, they meet every 5 years, in Caracas 1980, when there were many con-

tentious issues debated, narcotics was only slightly on the agenda. This time narcotics problems and international narcotics trafficking without any doubt was the primary agenda item. It received the most attention, certainly the most debate.

There was a clear consensus being represented by the many countries represented, over 100 countries, developing countries, underdeveloped countries and developed countries alike, that much more needs to be done on this problem.

I might also add while returning and having the opportunity to meet with members of the delegation led by Chairman Rodino that one of the individuals with me noted that a large portrait of Chairman Rodino in a window of a store in central Rome. And found out upon further investigation that he had served as the provost marshal in Rome. Is that correct?

Mr. RODINO. That's correct. I was the Commissioner.

Mr. THOMAS. And that they were even giving a 10-percent discount in that store on that portrait.

Mr. RODINO. And I could claim no profit from it.

Mr. THOMAS. As requested by the committee we are providing testimony on the status of our programs. And we have also provided the midyear update report on the international narcotics control strategy report, which we would look forward to discussing at length with you in the future.

Before beginning my formal testimony I will summarize what I consider to be the key points. I do want to comment on the trip to seven South American countries made by the Narcotics Select Committee, as well as to comment very briefly on the results that are apparent in the House Judiciary Committee trip to the Far East and South Asia.

I want to commend both of these delegations. I find that there is increasingly a broad understanding on the part of many countries that we do speak in the same voice. We may not always speak with the same voice here in Washington. But I do find that overseas they hear a consistent, uniform message.

Chairman Rangel, reading your final report and the messages we received in the progress of your trip en route, I believe there appears to be an appropriate concurrence of congressional views on the appropriate strategies to take on aiding South American countries in controlling illicit narcotics production and trafficking.

And we particularly note the select committee's statements and how they parallel our concern that narcotics trafficking in South America constitutes a challenge to the national security of these countries, as well as to their civil and social system. And the reflected awareness that narcotics trafficking is very much a part of a larger pattern of international lawlessness.

In your statement on returning to the United States the committee said that while it is deeply concerned over the continuing narcotics production and trafficking problem, it is encouraged by the meetings with the heads of government and reported on a new commitment on national efforts against narcotics growing and trafficking.

And importantly the increasing awareness that drug trafficking is our mutual problem. The committee I believe shares our finding that much of the increased activity in South America these past 2

years correlates directly to the emergence of a domestic drug abuse problem in the producer countries. And their awareness of their vulnerability to related problems such as corruption.

The committee reported it found an atmosphere of excitement and hope generated by new leadership in several countries. We welcome the committee's expression of support given to the newly elected presidents of Peru and Bolivia. And we particularly appreciate the committee's expressed understanding of the problems encountered in Peru and Bolivia, countries in which a score of problems have inhibited the level of narcotics control that we, the Congress and the governments in Lima and La Paz believe is necessary.

As you know Mr. Chairman, the department is increasing it's programming in these South American countries to take advantage of the new opportunities by this changing atmosphere.

So in sum we congratulate the committee on a successful mission and renew our commitment to work with you very closely sir on progressive approaches to achieving U.S. narcotics control objectives.

Obviously there are many problems to confront. Major problems that will not be readily overcome. And I know that while we seem agreed on the broad outlines of policy and strategy, we are not always agreed on that problem assessment. We do not agree nor do any of the heads of government with whom you met that the situation is uncontrollable or out of control.

But we believe that these problems can be successfully resolved over time and our purposes for this hearing include our providing you with an assessment that supports this belief.

A welcome change is occurring in the international narcotics control field. A change of perspective and approach that is resulting in a concurrence of nations to dramatically step up the pace against narcotics production and trafficking.

I fully concur with Congressman Gilman's indication of growing awareness, not only in Latin America, but also Europe. Part of the internationalization that I want to discuss a little bit more in depth this morning.

Because the concern over narcotics has now become a universal expression shared by most nations. This growing concern is due in large part to the recognition by governments from both developed and less developed countries that the illicit production, trafficking and abuse of drugs pose serious problems to their development, their societies, and in some cases to their national security.

This internationalization which has been one of our key policy objectives is a sine qua non for success against narcotics production and trafficking. I believe we have now arrived at a stage of building this consensus, this new alliance of nations which as Judiciary Chairman Rodino points out is indispensable for any progress in this area, and where this concerted effort will begin to make the difference.

We therefore welcome the opportunity to provide the committee with an updated assessment. We will explain how the international program is addressed in the broader national strategy. How we prioritize and execute the international strategy. Highlights are contained in an addendum to my testimony.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We are setting the example needed in proper crop eradication through spray programs resumed last Friday shortly after the Drug Enforcement Administration approved its environmental impact statement that permitted resumption of chemical eradication of marijuana cultivation in the United States.

This step has been long awaited by governments throughout this hemisphere. We cannot emphasize too strongly how closely our domestic efforts are scrutinized by those governments whom we urge to undertake crop control enforcement and demand reduction programs. This positive stroke, the eradication, is but the latest demonstration of the new leadership that the Department of Justice, Attorney General Meese, with whom I had the privilege of testifying yesterday to the Foreign Relations Committee, and DEA Administrator John Lawn, who in a few months have advanced in my opinion enforcement cooperation even beyond the good level we have had previously.

I believe we can all be confident in our approaches overseas because we can count on knowledgeable support and cooperation from the narcotics control community in this administration here at home.

In my travels I find that our commitment at home is increasingly recognized and praised by ranking officials of other governments. For the past 5 years the administration's international narcotics control strategy has given it's highest priority to eliminating illicit narcotics at the source by broadening the number and scope of eradication programs.

We are supporting eradication efforts in 14 countries. And in close cooperation and collaboration with the Drug Enforcement Administration, my office is providing equipment and technical assistance to improve interdiction and other enforcement efforts.

In several countries, State and the Agency for International Development are collaborating on assistance programs coupled to crop elimination. These control efforts are vitally enhanced by the public awareness programs that we, AID, and the United States Information Agency are sponsoring.

This momentum that I am speaking of in international narcotics control brings us continually closer hopefully to that day when we can report to this committee and to Congress that we have made sufficient progress in enough key countries to reduce availability in illicit narcotics entering our country.

However, it is clear that we are not yet in that position. Production and availability remain intolerably high. But the reductions and cultivations in Colombia, in Pakistan, Jamaica, and the promise in the new efforts in Panama, Burma, Thailand and elsewhere, give us increasing confidence that our goals are achievable.

These goals readily translate into tasks. The grower to user chains which stretch across six continents must be broken through a comprehensive program of international control. We must continue to apply pressure at all points in the chain through crop control, through increased seizures of both drug product and financial assets, through intensified investigations and prosecution of traffickers, and through effective treatment and prevention of drug abuse.

We also have no illusion of the difficulties we face in these tasks. Some governments, as you well know, do not have effective control of the territory of which crops are produced. In some instances our Government does not have political access that will permit agreement on a joint control program. We must secure the political commitment of other governments and international agencies.

And always we are severely challenged by the corruption, political fears, and the very real personal fears created by the violence which narcotics traffickers so willingly commit against governments and societies as well as individuals.

Understanding these phenomena and well cognizant that the United States could not do this job alone from either the political or resource perspectives, our planning in 1981 calls for a parallel expenditure of political capital on building a consensus within the international community.

Today we can look back at 1984 and 1985 as years in which we made important improvements in the program base. And we can look ahead to 1986 and 1987 as the years in which we will internationalize the response to this problem.

In the weeks and months to come we will surely reap the benefits of many of the diplomatic initiatives that have begun.

Let me summarize what we believe to be the highlights of actions on the programmatic and diplomatic levels. In 1981 only Mexico and Burma were eradicating illicit narcotics crops. In the coming fiscal year Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, Mexico, Belize, Panama, Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Brazil, Argentina, and Jamaica are all expected to begin or continue eradication programs.

There are several bright spots. Colombia continues its extensive marijuana eradication program and is working closely on effective cross border enforcement projects with Brazil and Peru. The results of Operation Condor, which were mentioned by Chairman Rangel, a joint Colombian-Peruvian operation assisted by the United States, have been quite good, as have the efforts of Brazil's operation Federico, both directed at cocaine production.

When I met recently with President Zia in Pakistan, he assured me that Pakistan is mounting an enforcement program against traffickers and heroin laboratories that will ultimately parallel their fine record in curbing the cultivation of opium poppy.

There have been important reorganizations of narcotics control agencies in Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, and Jamaica. The United States assisted aerial surveys that showed that the marijuana eradication program begun by Jamaica in January is effective and we are looking forward to the fall campaign.

I also believe that conversations held with a United States narcotics delegation which I led to China earlier this year have positive long-term implications.

Internally we continue to improve our cooperation. The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is insuring that issues having broad policy and program implications are considered both at the Cabinet and subcabinet levels.

I also find Mr. Chairman that officials in government after government are quite aware that the narcotics issue does have the attention of Secretary Shultz and Attorney General Meese.

We also have some problem areas——

Mr. RANGEL. Did you omit the President? Was that intentional?

Mr. THOMAS. I'm sorry. I would never do that. Later in my statement I would certainly intend to make it clear that the President's leadership in this administration from the White House and certainly the very commendable activities of the First Lady in the drug abuse awareness area which is helping my program immensely——

Mr. RANGEL. You don't have to mention the First Lady because I think internationally and in this country we are well aware of the great efforts that she is making internationally with the First Ladies of other countries. And so you didn't have to mention that.

But I did not want your testimony to ignore the interests that the President has.

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate you bringing that to my attention. As I have stated in previous testimony, the Department is not reluctant to use the leverage at its disposal to achieve our policy and program goals.

While we may disagree with certain Members of Congress on the particular sanctions that were contained in amendments this past session to the Foreign Assistance Act, we do not disagree with the importance of U.S. linkage with assistance and a country's commitment to narcotics control.

We in fact condition assistance to several countries on narcotics performance. This is true of AID projects in the narcotics growing areas of Peru, Bolivia, and Pakistan. And there are clauses in other agreements which affect still other projects in several countries.

Much of the assistance ticketed for Bolivia's Chapare region for example has not been spent because Bolivia has not started the eradication program.

Specific sanctions aside, I think the governments of many countries are increasingly aware that their performance on narcotics control strategy affects the whole of our bilateral relationship. Secretary Shultz has made this fact abundantly clear in several conversations as have other officials.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, I beg your indulgence. Normally we would have members rotate. But none of the members want to miss any of your testimony. So we will recess for whatever time it takes us to vote, and then we will return.

Mr. THOMAS. Fine.

[Whereupon, a recess was taken for a vote.]

Mr. RANGEL. The Chair will resume the hearing. And we apologize to the Secretary.

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all sir. I just have a few more remarks. If you will bear with me I have just a few more minutes.

There are several currently troubled situations in which there is a very clear recognition that narcotics control affects the whole of our bilateral relationship.

The situations in Belize, Bolivia, Peru, and Mexico are of special immediate concern to us. We are working closely with these governments to seek improved narcotics control, performances which they know must be improved for their sake and ours.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Each situation is addressed in more detail in our responses to the inquiries in the addendums to this testimony.

On the diplomatic front there has been considerable action, much of it encouraging and unprecedented. Indeed, we can say that in 1986 we are entering a new phase of this problem, a phase in which source countries promote narcotics control in the interests of their own national security and public welfare, with the political and financial support of a much broader interest coalition within the international community.

President Reagan and the leaders of Canada, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and the United Kingdom gave an invaluable boost to the priority assigned worldwide in narcotics control by their discussion at the economic summit meeting in Bonn last May, discussions which have led to further meetings in which collective strategies have been positively considered by national experts.

Their recommendations will be considered by the foreign ministers of the seven summit nations this month in New York. Mrs. Reagan held a widely acclaimed, highly successful mother meeting of 18 First Ladies in April, and another such meeting will be held in October in connection with the 40th anniversary observance at the United Nations.

Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has collected and directed the planning of a worldwide conference of drug abuse in 1987 under United Nations auspices. At the same time the United Nations is continuing the development of a new and strengthened international convention on narcotics trafficking.

We are supporting both of these initiatives. And in response to the question raised by Congressman Gilman I will assure you that we will give this issue of both the international convention as well as the 1987 world conference the attention it is due. We see these activities as not the culmination of but certainly an important step in the internationalization process we have been working so hard to promote.

There have also been important multilateral discussions of narcotics control initiatives sponsored by the Organization of American States and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the OAS and ASEAN, both of which were addressed by Secretary Shultz. These regional initiatives are also very welcome.

Broad agreement on the need to link economic assistance to the world community to progress in narcotics control, a goal which the Department of State shares with the Congress, is among the highest priority goals we bring to these discussions on the multilateral front. Increasingly the community of nations agrees that narcotics trafficking and abuse represent a threat to their national security as well as to their economic and social well-being.

This realization is spurring efforts for more cooperative multilateral enforcement and demand reduction programs. And we believe we are making progress in achieving that objective which in all but exceptional circumstances has greater long term potential for effecting action by source nation governments and sanctions imposed unilaterally by the United States.

In sum, we are working today in a different international climate, a new climate we have worked hard to create. There have

been many changes and perhaps the most profound has been the realization by other governments that drug trafficking is a threat to their national security and their economic and social well being, coupled with the reality that drug abuse epidemics have infested a great many countries whose leaders once thought they were immune.

We have long held that drug abuse is not just an American problem. For an opinion of course held to the contrary for so many years. Now in forum after forum the operative phrase is it's our problem. There are no more spectators.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of having reached this concurrence of world opinion. This stage at which there is increasingly this one community of interests. The great promise for our future is that at long last we are beginning to act in concert.

At a time when narcotics traffickers rule segments of some countries and dominate local economies, when the rule of terror holds sway over the rule of law, when the children of virtually every continent are at risk of drug addiction, certainly there can be no passive nations. We all must be active players. And that internationalization is becoming more of a reality.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks, submit as an addendum to my remarks a more detailed statement on progress country by country linked to our midyear update report to Congress. Thank you sir.

[Statement of Mr. Thomas appears on p. 32.]

Mr. RANGEL. That's good. And I would want to share that with the Members of Congress, at least a summary of that. And to let them know that your full report to us country by country is available. So we appreciate that .

I would ask for unanimous consent that the questions prepared by the staff be submitted to State so that we won't bog down this morning with all of those questions. And if there are no objections then I would see whether or not you could provide brief answers to us on that.

Mr. Secretary, I don't want to bog down with terminology but I see that there are some words that trigger interest with you. And those two words are uncontrollable and out of control. Now, I would like to associate myself with your position as relates to uncontrollable. If ever any Member of Congress believes that it is then we should just give up on it. So I think that it is controllable.

But you have a problem in stating that the growing of coca is out of control. Let's say just to get it started, in Bolivia?

Mr. THOMAS. The definition out of control or some other definition would best suffice. I would certainly say in my own words that the excessive cultivation of coca in Bolivia and Peru is intolerable. And that it must be brought under control. There are no signs that it will soon come under control.

Mr. RANGEL. What problem do you have with out of control? Because we were in the fields and the policemen, law enforcement said that they can't handle it. We talked with the military and law enforcement just said from the point of view of guns that they couldn't handle it.

And then the military said that it wasn't in their jurisdiction to get involved. That was a civil matter. And then they had some con-

cerns about the money being offered to their troops. And then the President pointed out that they are just trying to hold their government's fiscal policy together. And they hope with resources that they could eradicate.

But if I ever saw a situation completely out of control in talking with law enforcement in Peru and Bolivia, and since we have very little other dispute in other areas of having studied the problem in these countries, sure it is not tolerable and sure it is controllable, but it is out of control.

Mr. THOMAS. A difference in semantics. I'm sure that I would agree with you that when you look at it from a perspective of how much is being grown, how little control we do have over it at this point, perhaps it is more of a philosophical issue than a language.

Mr. RANGEL. OK, great. Good. And I hope that we find the time in the Congress so that we can enjoy that and discuss it.

It's bad and in Colombia we were impressed with their extensive marijuana eradication program. Could you—there has been some question as to what we have heard those of us who were on the trip, as relates to the eradication program with coca. Could you tell us what your understanding is of where that is?

Mr. THOMAS. I appreciate the comments on the marijuana eradication. We do feel that this year the vast majority of the marijuana harvest will be eradicated, the marijuana crop will be eradicated. This, as you will recall Mr. Chairman, was a primary concern of your committee a few years ago, encouraging us to move forward with great aggressiveness. And I am pleased to report that that program now is going to be a very successful one.

Coca control is a different matter. We have been experimenting with a variety of herbicides. We've had specialists in Colombia. We brought many Colombians here to confer with experts at agricultural universities around the country. The Colombian national police do now believe that they have identified some herbicides that are effective against coca.

These, unfortunately, do take some time to act. The coca bush is very sturdy. I would hope, and I think it's premature to say that we have found now conclusively the right herbicide. But we will continue those efforts. And I would hope that within the near future we will develop an effective herbicide or herbicides that will be environmentally safe, that we are under the restrictions of our own national laws, even while spraying them in another country.

And that will be environmentally safe. And once that's done I can assure you, based on discussions I've had in Colombia, that the Government of Colombia will launch an eradication effort against the coca bush as aggressively as they have done against marijuana.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, we feel that the other heads of government we found very little resistance assuming that it meets the standards that even Colombia would want, that other countries are prepared to use it.

But we did hear reports that we have the herbicide. And that there is just some political things that have to be worked out. That research has developed one that is accepted for environmental concerns as well as the destruction of that very strong rooted plant.

61-096 O - 86 - 2

Mr. THOMAS. Preliminary field studies do indicate that there is a herbicide that is effective in killing the plant. Some other studies are going to have to be conducted.

Mr. RANGEL. What is the timeframe on this thing?

Mr. THOMAS. I would hope that all of that could be wrapped up in the next couple of months. I will be in early fall to hold discussions with the Colombians on this.

Mr. RANGEL. Some of the committee members had thought that since there was a spirit of cooperation notwithstanding the legislative sanctions between the countries that we might continue our discussions with the countries through their appointed ambassadors here.

Of course before we would meet with them as a committee we would ask and expect to be briefed by the State Department as to the success or lack of it for some of the existing programs.

But what do you think of that idea?

Mr. THOMAS. I think it is important, not only in the countries you visited, but here in Washington there is often a tremendous amount of activity that takes place here. I know these foreign embassies have to monitor, that they do hear from people like yourselves, have visited their countries, talked to their leaders firsthand, and that you can impart to them directly congressional concerns. I think that is a very valuable effort.

And if there is a way that my bureau can provide any information to you or background we will be pleased to do so.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Gilman has convinced me and other members of the committee that we should be more involved in the United Nations deliberations in 1987 and indeed, the committee hopes to host if we can find the resources, a reception for the ambassadors at the United Nations to help them to share their views. Maybe we'll call it a hearing but we want to structure it as informally as possible.

Do you have any comments on an initiative such as that?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. I would first like to perhaps bring you up to date on where we stand on the preparations for the world conference in 1987.

And I believe that we have had something to do with this concept and idea. Over the past 2 years particularly we have been urging the United Nations leadership, the Secretary General and Under Secretary General for Political Affairs, William Buffum, to take a more active political role in the area of narcotics control.

They assured us that they were doing so. In the last UNGA session in the fall of 1984, leader after leader, particularly from Latin American countries, expressed their direct concern to Secretary General Perez de Cuellar of the need to do much more. This came from the meeting in Keto.

Various declarations were passed. And one of the things that came out of that meeting was the call for a new international convention against narcotics trafficking.

That helped stimulate some political activity as well. And what has emerged from all of this is a very direct role now taken by the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Not only because he was originally from a country that is affected by this problem, Peru, but he recognizes the globality, the uni-

versality of this problem, and has taken it upon himself to do something about it.

In fact, the comment has been made to me by very senior U.N. officials that narcotics control may be the one best area for the United Nations to truly do an effective job. And I think there is some truth in that.

The 1987 world conference hopefully, because the agenda has not yet been established, and we have expressed concern to the Secretary General about that agenda, that if the agenda deals with those issues that concern us collectively the most, effective narcotics control and drug abuse strategies, it can stay away from some of the other political accoutrements that sometimes accompany these conferences, then we will be fully supportive and we so indicated to the Secretary General.

Also of course this conference should be dealt with under our policy of no real growth in the United Nations. We believe that a conference like this can be done and administrated with existing resources in the United Nations.

As time progresses and the upcoming special session of the commission of narcotic drugs meeting in February in Vienna this year, and I hope sir that you will find time to attend. Again, I felt that your presence last year was very valuable, that this will be an issue discussed. In fact, Madame Tamar Oppenheimer, who has been I'm not sure official but certainly unofficially at this point designated by the Secretary General as the conference coordinator, has asked that we extend this special session of the CND a few days in order to discuss more fully the world conference.

As preparations proceed we will certainly keep you fully posted and we would seek your support and ideas. Because we see this as a very important opportunity to bring the world community at the highest political levels together to discuss in an apolitical way the need to do much more.

Mr. RANGEL. The chairman recognizes John Rowland.

Mr. ROWLAND. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. As one who didn't go on the recent trip, I certainly appreciate the testimony and the comments by the chairman.

I want to thank Mr. Thomas for some excellent testimony. And I'm looking forward to some of the answers we are going to see from the questions from this committee.

I guess I have a general question. And in looking over the general view of the programs of various countries which is going to be very helpful to a new member of this committee as well as someone who hasn't been able to visit those countries.

What do you find is the most common denominator among all the countries? Of course you've got some countries where the government is a little bit stronger than others. You've got some different attitudes. Is the largest common demoninator just a public awareness, a lack of priorities? What do you feel is the common issue running through those countries with regard to this?

Mr. THOMAS. I often use as a measuring stick if you will the liklihood of success or progress in a country directly related to the measurable political commitment on the part of the government.

Even a government that may not be strong or a government that may not have effective control over a certain territory where nar-

cotics are produced. But the political commitment is high, if it's sincere, then narcotics control programs become possible.

As the political commitment wavers or in some cases is weak, then narcotics control progress is slim. And often those are the same countries that ask a very excessive amount of assistance. I would suggest following that formula that as the political commitment remains high the amount of external resources go way down.

As that political commitment begins to soften then you begin to hear requests for very sizable amounts of assistance to somehow allow these countries to buy their way into the solution of the problem.

Mr. ROWLAND. So you feel the best thing we can do is, whether it is the world conference in the United Nations, is to enhance that political commitment.

Mr. THOMAS. Political commitment across the board. Yes sir. I would also add that political commitment, of course, comes from a number of directions. One being the recognition on the part of many governments that as I've stated in testimony this morning that their own national security or social well being of the state.

That is a reasonably new phenomena in most of these countries. Where in the past we used to hear the adage if there is no demand then we wouldn't have this supply problem, we don't hear that as much any more. Many of these countries are now suffering their own drug abuse problems are beginning to feel their own political pressure generated from within just as we have in this country.

In fact, the comment was made this morning by Mr. Gilman that many countries with which the select committee has held discussion are expressing interest in forming their own select committees. In fact, many new committees have been created around the world.

We recently had a visit of the select committee of the House of Commons from Parliament from the United Kingdom that was very active and published a very strong, aggressive report upon their return and the need to do much more in their own country.

So I think that you're seeing increased political awareness in these countries generated for the same reasons that we've seen it in our own.

Mr. ROWLAND. So you find the level of their political commitment as continuing to rise internally as well as externally.

Mr. THOMAS. The pressures on many of these countries coming from within has created some expanded opportunities for narcotics control programs.

Mr. ROWLAND. What do you see as a result? Legislation, police activities?

Mr. THOMAS. My primary role is to do what we can with these governments in negotiating agreements and providing technical and financial resources to allow them to primarily our No. 1 policy go to the source of the problem. That means crop control. Second, enforcement as close to the source as possible.

Part of the enforcement has to be, of course, interdiction and good investigation. But legislation as well. Where there is not adequate legislation or they have a weak judicial system, we try and help them in that area. That is often an area that is most difficult to deal with.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

And of course part of the political commitment issue can also be addressed by how the country deals with the problem of corruption. Often the most endemic problem we face in most of these countries. As the political commitment goes up, thus goes the crackdown against corruption.

I would point out to you as many of the members I'm sure have been following very closely the recent events in Peru. The new President of Peru has now fired, suspended, or otherwise removed scores and scores of policemen; some 37 police generals have been removed. Others are being removed day to day. I think this is a very firm indication on his part that he plans on dealing with the problem of corruption.

Mr. ROWLAND. Can you cite any examples or ways to combat the corruption and/or any drug plans that you've seen some of these countries coming up with that have been effective?

Mr. THOMAS. The most effective means of dealing with corruption is first of all at the highest levels of government to develop the political resolve to take the heat that, of course, is going to come back at you as a result of a crackdown on corruption.

That means that you must either fire people or prosecute people. And often this becomes a very difficult thing to do. A government unwilling to do that, of course, will be unwilling to effectively deal with the problem of corruption.

Mr. ROWLAND. Do you think some of those plans are working from your observations?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I do. Probably not as much as we would like.

Mr. ROWLAND. Thank you, very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Secretary, you travel quite a bit. And your presence certainly has been felt by those people that we met with.

In South America did you walk away with the impression that the narcotics trafficking is just so interrelated with the economic crisis in trade and all of the foreign policy objectives that these countries had?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I walk away with the feeling that the narcotics trafficking basically feeds off many of the problems in these countries. The fact that there is such economic difficulty. The fact that often the government cannot muster enough resources to project adequate enforcement presence in the area.

The fact that the governments themselves may be weak or unwilling to deal with contentious problems because they have so many other severe problems to deal with. This really provides a breeding ground for narcotics trafficking organizations that allows them to breed corruption and influence in those societies.

So it is interrelated in that sense. I believe, however, that as you step up enforcement activities, as we crack down on a regional basis, not this country by country, that most of these narcotics trafficking organizations are at least feeling the heat. They may not be burned yet, but they are beginning to feel the heat.

Mr. RANGEL. But we've had presidents that tell us that they felt that in cracking down against narcotics trafficking and being successful in certain areas that they would not really be able to tell what success they were having in having economic stability. Because that hard dollar is out there. And the removal of that dollar

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

sometimes adversely affects advancements that they are trying to make in improving the economic conditions.

They didn't say that they would want to tolerate that dollar. But that narcotic dollar being a part of their economy. But they were stating unequivocally that it's there and they have to deal with it.

Would you dispute those observations?

Mr. THOMAS. Partly, yes. We have looked at this problem in great depth. The common statement is that these gross national products of these countries depend on narcotics trafficking.

Mr. RANGEL. They didn't go that far.

Mr. THOMAS. But we've seen that and it's something that will be picked up in the media or other statements. We believe that most of the so-called narco dollars do not reside in the producing and trafficking countries. They move into safer and perhaps more lucrative banking safehaven. And in fact certainly the farmer doesn't get much out of this. The middlemen in most of these countries do not get too much out of it.

As it goes up the line, of course, the greater profits begin to take hold. In fact, I would say to the people that would raise that argument that we have seen no indications that the narcotics dollar generated by the narcotics trade has any positive impact in any of these countries.

If it does anything the dollars that do remain often go into the financing of other criminal activities. Certainly corruption and influence peddling. And often go into investments, such as in a Bogotá, Colombia, in a high rise building that certainly the common citizen couldn't afford to live in. Or into the investment of other criminal activities.

So it would have a very negative and sometimes inflation creating impact where this is a problem

Mr. RANGEL. Some of the leaders shared with us what they thought was the fact that the narcotics traffickers have been able to offer a higher quality of life for the coca plant producers than ever they could hope to offer through substitute profits.

Would you agree with that observation?

Mr. THOMAS. Not at all. Because I know you have, and members of your committee have, traveled to some of these remote areas. They are often the backwaters of the world. If you go to Tingo Maria as I certainly have and you see what that really means, it often means the ability to have a television and then there is not adequate electricity often to run those televisions. And perhaps a vehicle.

If that's improved quality of life then I'd have to agree. But then I would counterpose the fact that this coca farmer now has to deal with the violence, the criminality of the coca trade which he didn't have to deal with before. He has suddenly become part of a criminal enterprise which he was not part of before.

And I am convinced that many of these farmers are given alternatives, and I don't feel that's the only solution we have. They would gladly get out of that business. Most of them, or many of those that we talked to, particularly in some of the rougher parts of South America, find that they may have entrapped themselves in a way of life that in fact becomes very uncertain.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

That's why, by the way, when we talk about crop control programs in some of these areas, they now have something in stake. They now have a stake in criminal activity. They are fearful. They have often abandoned their legitimate agricultural crop in lieu of coca production.

Mr. RANGEL. Did you visit the area of Cuzco while you were in Peru?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I have not been to Cuzco for some time.

Mr. RANGEL. We don't want to dispute anything. But in Cuzco reports that we got from the Peruvians is that they used to have a legal crop that was grown there. And now they haven't got the slightest idea who is legal and who is not legal. And so therefore they cannot enforce the law except where they see large movements, whether by train or trucks obviously are heading in the direction that is not for legal production.

In addition to that, the police, rather than talking to us about their efforts at law enforcement because they admitted that they had no effort in law enforcement, was attempting to share with us what we had to give them for them to negotiate the farmers out of illicit production.

And the interpreter was our drug enforcement agent there. As a matter of fact, before the plane moved out the next morning, the national director of law enforcement came to me and said that he got the impression that I was not satisfied with the efforts made by local law enforcement agencies.

And I told him through our interpreter that what I heard from your law enforcement officials in Cuzco, and this is the man who interpreted then and he's interpreting now, is that there is no law enforcement by your representatives there. And that they are trying to negotiate with the farmers as to how they can get them out of illicit crop growing. And they were asking the United States what we are doing in terms of cutting back in demand and what we expect to put up in order for them to meet what——

What was the daily wage that he suggested? It was something like $9 or $8 a day. Nine or eight dollars a day that they were being paid by the narcotics traffickers. And I said that's what we heard from your people. And I asked for his response.

He said yes, we're not very organized in that area. And that's what tempted me to use the words out of control. In any event, one last thing. When last have you shared your experience in traveling around the world with Secretary Shultz?

Mr. THOMAS. I, of course, have traveled with the Secretary on certain trips. I do not often accompany the Secretary who is often on bilateral or multilateral missions which go beyond the narcotics area.

But certainly I consult with the Secretary with some frequency. I met with him early last week to discuss narcotics projects, new initiatives that we are taking, ways that he can be supportive to our efforts. We talked about a couple of key areas where I've asked him to undertake some direct initiatives which he has agreed to do.

So I am very satisfied with the Secretary of State's commitment to this issue. I have never been wanting for support from the Secretary or his key principals.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. RANGEL. You and I know that most Assistant Secretaries of State are satisfied with their relationship with the Secretaries. You know that.

Mr. THOMAS. When you work for a Secretary like I have you can be satisfied.

Mr. RANGEL. Right. But do you meet on a regular basis? Is it a formal schedule that you report, or is it just frequent?

Mr. THOMAS. It has been somewhat informal. But now we've moved to a formal schedule.

Mr. RANGEL. What would that formal schedule be like?

Mr. THOMAS. It will probably be every month or so.

Mr. RANGEL. It's being projected to be formal. But in the past it's been informal but frequent?

Mr. THOMAS. But I would say as frequent as I needed. In addition to that, any time I've had an issue, and frequently I do, that needs the Secretary's attention, I've always had ample access to him.

Mr. RANGEL. We certainly don't believe that just meeting with the Secretary is necessary for you to be effective. But how frequent would it be just to have an idea of how often you found it necessary to talk with him?

Mr. THOMAS. I would say that on a monthly basis I am certainly in touch with him at least once. Sometimes more frequently we coincide. On some other month I may not be in touch with him at all. It may not be necessary or our travel schedules may not coincide.

Mr. RANGEL. Do you have frequent or formal meetings with Dr. Carlton Turner on this subject?

Mr. THOMAS. I would say I meet with Carlton Turner either personally or over the telephone two or three times a week.

Mr. RANGEL. Do you know whether the Secretary has in the past had trips abroad specifically dealing with the question of international narcotics production in the countries that you've frequented? Has he ever made a special effort to visit these countries?

Mr. THOMAS. He has made certainly a special effort in visiting, and his travel schedule is extensive, in visiting the countries that are key problem countries for us. He is always including the narcotics problem on his agenda.

And often as one of the key agenda items.

Mr. RANGEL. But he has never specifically had the type of trip that this committee or you would have that the primary purpose was dealing with the question of international narcotics control?

Mr. THOMAS. He would of course carry with him to any country he visits as our primary representative for the broad range of foreign policy issues many things. But where appropriate, narcotics has always been on the agenda.

Mr. RANGEL. I'm going to assume that the President and the Secretary would do that as part of their constitutional responsibilities, to enforce the existing law. But you would say that the Secretary has not found it necessary to have a specific trip to the narcotic-producing countries because it is always on his foreign policy agenda.

Mr. THOMAS. I would agree with that.

Mr. RANGEL. And how often do you meet with the President to discuss your observations as to the impact that we're having as relates to the illicit growing of drugs?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. THOMAS. Interestingly, the first full Cabinet meeting held by President Reagan in his second administration was dedicated to the single subject of narcotics, both domestic and international. I briefed the President and all Cabinet members at that time.

Since that time I have briefed the Cabinet at various levels and various groupings of the Cabinet on two separate occasions. I've met with the Vice President on a number of occasions on the narcotics issue. So I believe that President Reagan and certainly his Cabinet have been very well informed and are keeping informed.

Yesterday Attorney General Meese testified at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I joined him in that testimony as part of the testimony itself. And, of course, the frequent meetings of the drug enforcement policy board, which bring together several of the principal Cabinet members to discuss narcotics on a frequent basis.

I think that provides not only the Cabinet but the President with a full range of information and options.

Mr. RANGEL. So in the last couple of years how many times have you met with the President on this issue?

Mr. THOMAS. I have met directly with the President one time on this issue.

Mr. RANGEL. In the last 2 years?

Mr. THOMAS. I will have completed my first year as Assistant Secretary this October. And I met with President Reagan in April of this past year.

Mr. RANGEL. Do you get a chance to discuss these things with the First Lady at all?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I have had a number of occasions to do so. We have been very much involved of course with the preparations that were linked to her first First Ladies conference which were very successful.

I am involved, as members of my bureau are, with preparations for the upcoming First Ladies conference in New York in October, October 21 at the United Nations. In fact I will moderate that session with the First Lady.

I and my staff of course are also in frequent contact with her chief of staff and the members that work directly for her on this drug abuse issue.

Mr. RANGEL. The committee and the Congress was impressed with the impact that the First Ladies conference had. Do you think that if the President was to call in the foreign ministers of these drug-producing countries that it might serve some worthwhile purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. I would say that the First Ladies conference, of course, perhaps one of the reasons it was so successful and so unique, it brought together what we recognize as a growing concern on the part of many countries for the drug abuse phenomenon, away from the government and strict policy area.

Mr. RANGEL. What benefit would it be? Is there deterrent if we bring in the Government as opposed to the First Ladies?

Mr. THOMAS. I'm saying not a deterrent but what made the First Ladies conference unique was the nonpolicy nature of addressing a new audience.

Mr. RANGEL. What made it unique was that this was the first initiative coming out of the President's office.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. THOMAS. I don't think it was the first initiative.

Mr. RANGEL. As relates to drug trafficking.

Mr. THOMAS. No. I would say that the President's office has issued many initiatives. The 1982 and 1984 strategy, both the Federal strategy and the national strategy, I think, are the President's strategies. So I think most of the initiatives, whether it be the National Narcotics Board and interdiction system- —

Mr. RANGEL. Not so much international. Reaching out to these countries, the First Lady did it in a very dramatic way and if the President has done it, it went unnoticed.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, often it does go unnoticed. The President on numerous——

Mr. RANGEL. What was it that he did that I missed internationally?

Mr. THOMAS. As I say it does go unnoticed, often purposely. The President has——

Mr. RANGEL. Oh, he's doing it—I see. I'm going to try to explain that that's what I've been doing to my constituents. I've been doing a hell of an effective job but I'm doing it in a way that I don't want to attract too much attention to it.

Mr. THOMAS. I would say, sir, that the margin of votes that the President received in 1984 must indicate he's doing something right.

Mr. RANGEL. We're bordering on having this turn the wrong way. So let me thank you for the testimony which you've given. We look forward to working very closely with you. And I want to thank you for sharing the services of Jim Gromly who really made a major contribution to our mission. And thank you for the materials that you've given to us and to Jack Cusack in making sure that the mission was successful. Thank all of you.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you again and congratulate you on a very successful trip. It is of great help to us where we can work together overseas. And speak with a common voice that we have been able to speak with. Thank you.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you. The Chair apologizes. He didn't see his friend and colleague Clay Short who joined with us. We missed you on the trip because of your concern. And we look forward to planning the next trip around your availability.

The meeting stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, the committee was adjourned.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATEMENT OF

THE HONORABLE

CHARLES B. RANGEL

CHAIRMAN

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS

ABUSE AND CONTROL

ON

HEARING ON

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

September 12, 1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GOOD MORNING LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, TODAY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL WILL CONTINUE ITS EXAMINATION OF OUR STATE DEPARTMENT'S PROGRAMS AND POLICIES IN THE AREA OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL.

THE TIMING OF TODAY'S HEARING IS SIGNIFICANT IN THAT THE SELECT COMMITTEE HAS RECENTLY RETURNED FROM A 17 DAY STUDY MISSION TO THE DRUG PRODUCING AND SMUGGLING NATIONS OF SOUTH AMERICA. ACCOMPANYING ME ON THIS IMPORTANT TRIP WERE BEN GILMAN, THE RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER OF OUR COMMITTEE, FRANK GUARINI, ED TOWNS, AND LARRY COUGHLIN. WE WERE ALSO JOINED BY CONGRESSMEN NORMAN LENT AND ANDY IRELAND.

THIS STUDY MISSION WAS A FOLLOW-UP TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE'S VISIT TO LATIN AMERICA IN 1983. WHILE THERE ARE SOME SIGNS OF PROGRESS; PARTICULARLY HEIGHTENED RECOGNITION BY GOVERNMENT LEADERS IN SOUTH AMERICA OF THE SEVERITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS PROBLEM, THE COMMITTEE FOUND A SHOCKING INCREASE IN THE GROWTH OF COCA PRODUCTION AND THE ABILITY OF DRUG TRAFFICKERS TO OPERATE UNIMPEDED IN VAST AREAS OF LATIN AMERICA.

IN COCA GROWING AREAS OF COLOMBIA, PERU, BOLIVIA, AND ECUADOR GOVERNMENTS ARE HELPLESS IN THE FACE OF SOPHISTICATED, WELL-FINANCED NARCO-TRAFFICKING ORGANIZATIONS. COMBINATIONS OF

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COCAINE, MONEY AND VIOLENCE ARE ATTEMPTING TO SUPPRESS THE DEVELOPMENT OF DEMOCRACY IN SOUTH AMERICA. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT THE UNITED STATES JOIN TOGETHER WITH OUR NEIGHBORS IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE IN A REGIONAL EFFORT TO COMBAT THE NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS AND CREATE AN ATMOSPHERE IN WHICH DEMOCRACY AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY CAN BE FOSTERED AND GROW.

DESPITE THE CRISIS OF RUNAWAY PRODUCTION OF COCA, WE ARE ENCOURAGED BY OUR DISCUSSIONS WITH THE HEADS OF GOVERNMENT IN LATIN AMERICA. AS OPPOSED TO WHAT WE FOUND TWO YEARS AGO, COLOMBIA, PERU, ECUADOR,AND BOLIVIA RECOGNIZE THE SEVERITY OF THE PROBLEM POSED BY NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING AND THAT THEY TOO ARE VULNERABLE. ARGENTINA, BRAZIL, AND URUGUAY ARE AWARE OF THE CORRUPTING INFLUENCE OF THIS TRADE AND ARE BEGINNING TO WORK WITH THEIR NEIGHBORS TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING.

THERE IS NOW UNIVERSAL RECOGNITION IN THE COUNTRIES THAT WE VISITED THAT ILLICIT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING IS OUR MUTUAL PROBLEM. WE CAN NOW END THE DEBATE AS TO WHETHER PRODUCERS OR CONSUMERS ARE TO BLAME AND, EACH ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY, MOVE ON TO COOPERATIVE EFFORTS TO PROTECT OUR CITIZENS FROM THE PLAGUE OF DRUG ABUSE.

WE ALSO LOOK FORWARD TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRESS WE ARE HAVING IN THE OPIUM PRODUCING AREAS OF

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST ASIA. ALTHOUGH THE DANGERS OF COCAINE ADDICTION HAVE CAPTURED THE ATTENTION OF POLICY MAKERS AND THE MEDIA, WE MUST NOT LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT OUR NATION AND WESTERN EUROPE REMAINS IN THE MIDST OF A HEROIN EPIDEMIC.

WE WILL EXAMINE IN PART TODAY OUR EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE THE CULTIVATION OF POPPIES AND OPIUM CULTIVATION IN THE TRIBAL AREAS OF PAKISTAN. WE WILL INQUIRE INTO OUR INITIATIVES TO HALT THE SMUGGLING OF OPIUM AND HEROIN FROM AFGHANISTAN AND IRAN. WE WILL LOOK AT WHAT PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN CONTROLLING THE ABUNDANCE OF OPIUM PRODUCED IN BURMA AND IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A COMPREHENSIVE POPPY ERADICATION PLAN IN THAILAND.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE IS PLEASED TO HAVE AS ITS WITNESS THIS MORNING THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS MATTERS, JON THOMAS. I INVITE MR. THOMAS TO BRING THE COMMITTEE UP TO DATE ON THE PROGRESS WE HAVE MADE IN CONTROLLING INTERNATIONAL DRUG PRODUCTION SINCE THE RELEASE OF THE INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL STRATEGY REPORT (INCSR) LAST FEBRUARY. I AM PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN KNOWING NOT ONLY WHAT HIS BUREAU IS DOING IN THIS REGARD, BUT ALSO THE ACTIVITIES OF OTHER BRANCHES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE IN THIS VITALLY IMPORTANT AREA.

BEFORE WE BEGIN TO TAKE MR. THOMAS' TESTIMONY, I CALL ON THE RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER, MR. GILMAN, TO MAKE ANY OPENING REMARKS HE WISHES.

Opening Statement of the Honorable Benjamin A. Gilman, (NY-22) at the hearing on International Narcotics Control, September 12, 1985

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As always, it is a pleasure to have Jon Thomas, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics Matters (INM), appear before our Narcotics Select Committee to report on the Administration's efforts to fight illicit narcotics production, trafficking and abuse which is spreading at an alarming rate throughout the world.

We have just returned from a study mission to South America, and while we are pleased at the progress being made in some nations in curbing the illicit drug production, the sad fact is that we are expecting that more illegal drugs will enter the United States this year than ever before in our history. The continuing massive influx of cocaine from South America is particularly significant. Despite all the highly publicized efforts at interdicting drugs bound for the United States, the problem continues to get worse and worldwide production of opium, coca leaf and cannabis far exceeds the amounts currently being consumed by drug abusers. Our nation, especially our youth, is being destroyed by drugs and we seem to be at a loss in comprehensively attacking this problem.

On the positive side, our trip to South America did reveal some signs for optimism. The Governments of Colombia and Ecuador have taken strong steps against drug production and trafficking, both individually and bilaterally with each other. The new Government of Peru, under President

Alan Garcia, has pledged forceful action against coca production and drug trafficking, and recent actions indicate that it is committed to continuing this effort. We must do everything possible to see that these actions continue, and I will be most interested in hearing what plans the Administration has to achieve this goal.

No mention of international narcotics problems would be complete without mention of the severe heroin problems in Western Europe, and the rapid increase of cocaine abuse in that part of the world.

While efforts to fight cocaine trafficking is directly related to our success in South America, we must not forget that we are also waging "war" against heroin, marihuana, PCP and other illicit drugs and that the illicit production of heroin from the Golden Triangle of Burma, Laos and Thailand, and the Golden Crescent of Afghanistan, Iran and Pakistan remain a clear and present danger for all mankind.

In closing, I would like to add that we meet at a time of enormous opportunity in the fight against drug trafficking and drug abuse. Drug producing and trafficking nations are beginning to feel the impact of narcotics abuse in their own populations, and they are reeling under the economic impact of a narco-underground, untaxed inflationary economy. Many nations have established committees and commissions to deal with drug problems within their borders. We must seize the opportunity to work with these nations to expand their individual efforts and to encourage the creation of regional and worldwide drug strategies to combat narcotics trafficking and drug abuse.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I know that you share this belief, and I want to commend you for your efforts to date, and urge you to continue to work with the Congress and this Committee in helping to wage a comprehensive assault against the drug traffickers and the menace of drug abuse. As President Leon Febres Cordero of Ecuador said in our meeting with him: "The international community must act before it is too late—too late in providing the resources, equipment, personnel, and funds; too late in enacting the necessary alliances needed to wage 'war' effectively against the drug traffickers; too late in protecting the health of our citizens; and too late in protecting democratic societies from the narco-terrorists."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TESTIMONY
ASSISTANT SECRETARY JON R. THOMAS
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS MATTERS
DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE & CONTROL
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
September 12, 1985

MR. CHAIRMAN:

As requested by the Select Committee, we are providing testimony on the status of our programs in nations where illicit narcotics are produced, with emphasis on South America, and noting the changes which have occurred since our last formal report to Congress in February. The Mid-Year Update on the International Narcotics Control Strategy Report has just been submitted to Congress.

Before beginning my formal testimony, I want to comment on the trip to seven South American countries which you and your Committee completed August 19, and thank you for the report and briefing which you provided the Department.

Reading your final report, and the messages we received on progress enroute, there appears to be an important concurrence of Department and Congressional views on the appropriate strategy to take in aiding South American countries in controlling illicit narcotics production and trafficking.

We particularly note the Committee's statements parallel our concern that narcotics trafficking in South America constitutes a challenge to the national security of these countries, as well as to their civil and social systems, and the reflected awareness that narcotics trafficking is very much a part of a larger pattern of international lawlessness.

In your statement on returning to the United States, the Committee said that, while it is deeply concerned over the continuing narcotics production and trafficking problem, it is encouraged by their meetings with heads of government, and reported on a new commitment to national efforts against narcotics growing and trafficking, and, importantly, the increasing awareness that drug trafficking is our mutual problem. The Committee shares our finding that much of the increased activity in South America these past two years correlates directly to the emergence of domestic drug abuse problems in the producer countries, and their awareness of their vulnerability to related problems such as corruption.

The Committee reported it found "an atmosphere of excitement and hope" generated by new leadership in several countries. We welcome the Committee's expressions of support given to the newly elected Presidents of Peru and Bolivia. We particularly appreciate the Committee's expressed understanding of the problems encountered in Peru and Bolivia, countries in which a score of problems have inhibited the level of narcotics control action that we, the Congress and the governments in Lima and La Paz believe is necessary.

As you know, the Department is increasing its programming in key South American countries to take advantage of the new opportunities created by this changing atmosphere.

In sum, we congratulate the Committee on a successful mission and renew our commitment to work with you on progressive approaches toward achieving U.S. narcotics control objectives.

Obviously, there are many problems to confront -- major problems that will not be readily overcome. And, I know that, while we seem agreed on the broad outlines of policy and strategy, we are not agreed on that problem assessment. We do not agree, nor do any of the heads of government with whom you met, that the situation is "uncontrollable" or "out of control."

We believe that these problems can be successfully resolved, over time, and our purposes for this hearing include our providing you an assessment that supports this belief.

A welcome change is occurring in the international narcotics control field -- a change of perspective and approach that is resulting in a concurrence of nations to dramatically step up the pace against narcotics production and trafficking.

The concern over narcotics has now become a universal expression, shared by most nations. This growing concern is in large part due to the recognition by governments, from both developed and less-developed countries, that the illicit production, trafficking and abuse of drugs pose serious problems to their development, their societies, and in some cases, to their national security.

This internationalization, which has been one of our key policy objectives, is a sine qua non for success against narcotics production and trafficking. I believe we have now arrived at a stage of building this new consensus, this new alliance of nations, where this concerted effort will begin to make the difference.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We therefore welcome this opportunity to provide the Committe with an updated assessment.

We will explain how the international program is addressed in the broader national strategy, how we prioritize and execute the international strategy, and especially how that strategy is changing. Highlights of policy and program initiatives are provided in this statement, and more detailed responses are provided in an attachment to the statement.

I will begin my testimony by discusssing, not the issues and events overseas, but the good news here at home. We cannot emphasize too strongly how closely our domestic efforts are scrutinized by those governments whom we urge to undertake crop control, enforcement and demand reduction programs.

We are setting the example needed on crop eradication through the spraying programs resumed last Friday, shortly after the Drug Enforcement Administration approved its environmental impact statement that permitted resumption of chemical eradication of marijuana cultivation in the United States. This step has been long awaited by governments throughout this Hemisphere.

This positive stroke is but the latest demonstration of the new leadership at Justice -- Attorney General Meese and DEA Administrator John Lawn -- who in a few months have advanced enforcement cooperation even beyond the good level we have previously had.

We can be all the more confident in our approaches overseas because we can count on knowledgable support and cooperation from the narcotics control community in this Administration -- cooperation in our international programs matched by equally effective programming here. In my travels, I find that our commitment at home is increasingly recognized and praised by ranking officials of other governments.

For the past five years, the Administration's international narcotics control strategy has given its highest priority to eliminating illicit narcotics at the source by broadening the number and scope of eradication programs.

We are supporting eradication efforts in 14 countries and in close collaboration with the Drug Enforcement Administration INM is providing equipment and technical assistance to improve interdiction and other enforcement efforts in these and other countries. In several countries, State and the Agency for International Development are collaborating on assistance programs coupled to crop elimination. These control efforts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are vitally enhanced by the public awareness programs that we, AID, and the United States Information Agency are sponsoring that have done so much to persuade the governments and citizens of other countries that drug abuse is a problem common to many nations.

This momentum in international narcotics control brings us continuously closer to that day when we can report that we have made sufficient progress in enough key countries to reduce availability of illicit narcotics entering our country.

We are not yet in that position. Production and availability remain intolerably high, but the major reductions in cultivation in Colombia, Pakistan, Jamaica, and the promise inherent in the new efforts in Panama, Burma, Thailand and elsewhere give us increasing confidence that our goals are achievable.

Those goals readily translate into tasks. The grower-to-user chains which stretch across six continents must be broken through a comprehensive program of international control. We must continue to apply pressure at all points in the chain -- through crop control; through increased seizures of both drug products and financial assets; through intensified investigation and prosecution of traffickers; and through effective treatment and prevention of drug abuse.

We have no illusions about the difficulty of these tasks. Some governments do not have effective control of the territory in which crops are produced. In some instances, our government does not have political access that will permit agreement on a joint control program; we must secure the political commitments of other governments and international agencies. And, always, we are severely challenged by the corruption, political fears, and the very real personal fears created by the violence which narcotics traffickers so willingly commit against governments, societies and individuals alike.

Understanding these phenomena, and well cognizant that the United States could not do this job alone from either the political or resource perspective, our planning in 1981 called for a parallel expenditure of political capital on building a consensus within the international community.

Today, we can look back at 1984 and 1985 as years in which we made important improvements in the program base, and, we can look ahead to 1986 and 1987 as the years in which we will internationalize the response to this problem. In the weeks and months to come, we will surely reap the benefits of the diplomatic initiatives begun when the United States was the only nation willing to commit major resources to support control programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Let me summarize what we believe to be the highlights of actions on the programmatic and diplomatic levels.

In 1981, only Mexico and Burma were eradicating illicit narcotics crops. In the coming fiscal year, Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, Mexico, Belize, Panama, Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, Panama, Brazil, Argentina and Jamaica are all expected to begin or continue eradication programs, many of them at all-time high levels of effectiveness.

There are several bright spots. Colombia continues its extensive marijuana eradication program, and is working closely on effective cross-border enforcement projects with Brazil and Peru. The results of Operation Condor (or Relampago), a joint Peruvian-Colombian operation assisted by the U.S., have been quite good, as have the efforts of Brazil's Operation Frederico, both directed at cocaine production and both utilizing U.S. assistance. When I met recently with President Zia, he assured me that Pakistan is mounting an enforcement program against traffickers and heroin laboratories that will ultimately parallel their fine recent record in curbing cultivation of opium poppy. There have been important reorganizations of narcotics control agencies in Mexico, Peru, Bolivia and Jamaica. U.S. assisted aerial surveys show that the marijuana eradication program begun by Jamaica in January is effective and we are looking forward to the fall campaign. I think the conversations held by a U.S. narcotics control delegation which I led to China earlier this year have positive, long-term implications.

Internally, we continue to improve our cooperation. The National Drug Enforcement Policy Board is ensuring that issues having broad policy and program implications are considered at both the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet levels. I find that officials in government after government are quite aware that the narcotics issue has the attention of Secretary Shultz and Attorney General Meese. We are also improving our data collection and our intelligence analysis. There is considerable emphasis on expanding extradition and mutual legal assistance treaties, the latter so vital to our efforts to curb the money laundering practices of traffickers and seize assets.

But, there are also question marks.

As I have stated in previous testimony, the Department is not reluctant to use the leverage at its disposal to achieve our policy and program goals. While we may disagree with certain Members of Congress on the particular sanctions that were contained in amendments this past session to the Foreign Assistance Act, we do not disagree on the importance of linkage

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

between U.S. assistance and a country's commitment to narcotics control. We in fact condition assistance to several countries on narcotics performance; this is true of AID projects in the narcotics growing areas of Peru, Bolivia and Pakistan, and, there are clauses in other agreements which affect still other projects in several countries. Much of the assistance ticketed for Bolivia's Chapare region, for example, has not been spent because Bolivia has not started an eradication program.

Specific sanctions aside, I think the governments of many countries are increasingly aware that their performance on narcotics control strongly affects the whole of our bilateral relationship. Secretary Shultz has made this fact abundantly clear in several conversations, as have other officials.

There are several currently troubled situations in which there is very clear recognition that narcotics control affects the whole of our bilateral relationship.

The situations in Belize, Bolivia, Peru and Mexico are of special immediate concern. We are working closely with these governments to seek improved performance on narcotics control, performances which they know must be improved, for their sake and ours. Each situation is addressed in more detail in our responses to Committee inquiries in the addendum.

On the diplomatic front, there has been considerable action, much of it encouraging and unprecedented.

Indeed, we can say that in 1986 we are entering a new phase of this problem, a phase in which source countries promote narcotics control in the interests of their own national security and public welfare -- with the political and financial support of a much broader interest coalition within the international community.

President Reagan and the leaders of Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom gave an invaluable boost to the priority assigned worldwide to narcotics control by their discussions at the economic summit meeting in Bonn last May, discussions which have led to further meetings at which collective strategies have been positively considered by national experts. Their recommendations will be considered by the foreign ministers of the seven summit nations this month in New York.

Mrs. Reagan held a widely-acclaimed, highly successful mother-to-mother meeting of 18 First Ladies in April, and another such meeting will be held in October in connection with the 40th anniversary observances at the United Nations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has directed the planning of a worldwide conference on drug abuse in 1987 under United Nations auspices. At the same time, the United Nations is continuing the development of a new and strengthened international convention on narcotics trafficking. We are supporting both of these initiatives. There have also been important multilateral discussions of narcotics control initiatives sponsored by the Organization of American States and the Association of South East Asian Nations, both of which were addressed by Secretary Shultz.

Broad agreement on the need to link economic assistance from the world community to progress on narcotics control, a goal which the Department of State shares with the Congress, is among the highest priority goals we bring to all of these discussions on the multilateral front. Increasingly, the community of nations agrees that narcotics trafficking and drug abuse represent a threat to their national security, as well as to their economic and social well-being. This realization is spurring efforts for more cooperative multilateral enforcement and demand reduction programs. And, we believe we are making progress in achieving that objective, which, in all but exceptional circumstances, has greater long-term potential for effecting action by source nation governments than sanctions imposed unilaterally by the United States.

In sum, we are working today in a different international climate -- a new climate we have worked hard to create. There have been many changes, and perhaps the most profound has been the realization by other governments that drug trafficking is a threat to their national security and their economic and social well-being, coupled with the reality that drug abuse epidemics have infested a great many countries whose leaders once though they were immune.

We have long held that drug abuse is not just an American problem. Foreign opinion, of course, held to the contrary for so many years. Now, in forum after forum, the operative phrase is, "It's our problem." There are no more spectators.

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of having reached this concurrence of world opinion, this stage at which there is increasingly this one community of interest. The great promise for our future is that, at long last, we are beginning to act in concert.

In a time when narcotics traffickers rule segments of some countries and dominate local economies, when the rule of terror holds sway over the rule of law, when the children of virtually every continent are at risk to drug addiction, there can be no passive nations. We all must be active players.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADDENDUM:

Detailed Responses to Committee Questions

Narcotics Control Strategies

The basic plan for achieving the ultimate objectives of this Administration, which are to reduce and ultimately prevent the abuse of drugs in our society, is contained in the National Strategy for Prevention of Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking, which has been developed by the Drug Abuse Policy Office in the White House. This strategy has been developed in cooperation with the numerous Federal agencies whose efforts and resources are essential to achievement in the five emphasis areas: prevention; treatment and rehabilitation; research; drug law enforcement; and, international narcotics control.

The National Strategy recognizes the need for a balance between demand reduction and supply reduction and other enforcement activities, and those of us who concentrate primarily on supply reduction and enforcement are nevertheless actively engaged in supporting the broad national prevention effort, in which Mrs. Reagan and the White House Drug Abuse Policy Office have played prominent roles. At the same time, the Department of State, the Agency for International Development, and the United States Information Agency, with input from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, are engaged in assisting other governments in developing national prevention campaigns, particularly in source nations where domestic drug abuse has frequently reached epidemic levels.

The broad framework of this National Strategy is augmented by such plans as the recent submission of the National Drug Enforcement Policy Board and the annual International Narcotics Control Strategy Report which we and other agencies prepare twice a year. Our mid-year update was submitted this week, and contains reports on program progress through August 1. The National Strategy, which is approved by the President, gives a high priority to reducing production of illicit narcotics and related enforcement actions at the source of supply.

In 1981, we sought a new diplomatic and program strategy -- a strategy which recognized our dependence on the effectiveness of foreign governments in eradication and interdiction; -- a strategy which recognized the constant shifts of production zones and trafficking routes and was therefore designed to fulfill the need for crop control programs operating simultaneously in all key sectors; -- and a strategy which acknowledged the reality that any program dependent upon the political will of governments historically

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

beset with social, political and economic problems was by definition a long-term commitment.

The Diplomatic Strategy

Today, more than ever, drug source and consumer nations alike have a common interest in the success of control programs. The multiple effects drug trafficking can have on every source and transit nation are increasingly felt in Latin America, Southeast and Southwest Asia -- crime, corruption, economic destabilization, political manipulation, and epidemic drug abuse. Indeed, some source countries are realizing that they are the first beneficiaries of programs to curb trafficking and its related excesses.

It is clear that any effective prescription must call for bilateral and multilateral action from an increasing number of resources. No one nation has all of the political, financial and material resources that are needed. More than ever, international strategies in 1985 and beyond must give top priority to crop control -- bans on cultivation and production, enforced when necessary by eradication. An effective international strategy should offer financial and technical assistance where needed for narcotics control projects. The U.S will continue to provide assistance, which should be linked to crop control agreements to ensure success in reducing production.

But, donor assistance is only a part of the success equation. Governments of producing nations must demonstrate the political will to undertake effective crop control and interdiction programs. The corruption that has undermined control efforts in many source countries must be stamped out by strong and determined governments.

Not least, the international community must make common cause in a more vigorous, more widespread, and more united effort to control international narcotics production and trafficking."

The international community should:

- oo Demonstrate the high global priority of the narcotics control and drug abuse issues.
- oo Dramatize the point that drug abuse is a problem that knows no national boundaries.
- oo Broaden the base of political support for control measures, particularly in bilateral relations with source country governments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- oo Channel the direction of the proposed UN conference in 1987 to ensure it embraces the global dimensions of the problem in the most effective manner.

- oo Enlist support not only for traditional measures, such as eradication and interdiction, but also legal measures which can destabilize narcotics trafficking networks -- including extradition, asset seizure and forfeiture, and interruption of money laundering schemes.

- oo Broaden the base of bilateral and multilateral support for control programs and related developmental activity in growing regions.

- oo Enhance the collection and sharing of narcotics related intelligence.

- oo Increase national and international awareness of drug abuse, its social, political, economic and health implications, and the need for control and preventive measures; and

- oo Improve cooperation and coordination among governments in order to establish a common front and uniform policy.

The individual efforts of President and Mrs. Reagan have done much to propel narcotics control and drug abuse prevention toward their highest level political and social priorities.

President Reagan and the heads of state/government from Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Japan and the United Kingdom engaged in an unplanned and unprecedented discussion of the need for improved narcotics control programs during their meeting in Bonn in May.

This discussion of narcotics trafficking and drug abuse at this level drew the worldwide attention of other governments and the media, and led to a call for a meeting of narcotics experts to produce recommendations for consideration by foreign ministers of the seven nations. The experts met in Bonn July 17-18 to consider a wide range of issues, including the foreign policy priority which should be assigned to narcotics control, the linkages between economic assistance and narcotics control, the implications for national security and international lawlessness, and a host of other key issues.

The discussion at the summit was triggered by consideration of the highly successful and much noted First

Ladies conference on drug abuse, a mother-to-mother discussion among 18 First Ladies, which Mrs. Reagan sponsored in Washington in April. A second such conference, where Mrs. Reagan will again be the host, will involve involve First Ladies who will be attending the fortieth anniversary celebrations at the United Nations, and is scheduled for October 21 in New York.

At the beginning of the General Assembly session in late 1984, the Secretary General was approached by many heads of state, particularly from Latin America, who called for a more aggressive United Nations program to control narcotics trafficking. One result was the Secretary General's call for a global conference on narcotics and drug abuse which may be held in 1987. This proposal will be considered at the upcoming General Assembly. We support the convening of a worldwide conference, which could galvanize national political commitments to increased anti-narcotics efforts. We will work with the United Nations and other governments on those narcotics issues of priority interest to the U.S. government.

There is considerable impetus behind the effort, which largely originated with South American governments, to develop a drug trafficking convention; resolutions to create and define such a convention were thoroughly discussed at the annual meeting of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in Vienna in February; a report from the Secretary General is due November 1, and, next February, the Commission will decide on the mechanism by which a new convention would be drafted. The United States supports this CND initiative and we will be an active participant in drafting such a convention. Our priority issues in a trafficking convention are: extradition, mutual legal assistance, and asset forfeiture and seizure.

DEA Administrator John Lawn and I just returned from the United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention in Milan. This congress meets every five years, and delegates were pleased at the positive change over a half-decade, giving narcotics control prominence in the discussions this year.

This past spring, INM led a delegation of U.S. agencies, formed as a "cocaine truth squad," to Europe where our reponses to questions concerning programs to curb coca production in South America, and the epidemiology and treatment of cocaine abuse, were extremely well received. I believe this sharing of information not only helped the Europeans but bolstered their resolve to take part in multilateral coca control efforts.

The Program Strategy

As I stated at the outset of this testimony, we do not oppose the use of leverage, and governments which receive assistance should have no misconceptions about the linkage between the United States providing assistance and their performance on narcotics control, or its affect on the whole of our bilateral relationships.

Program Challenges

We are concerned about the performance on narcotics control and therefore our bilateral relationship with every country in which narcotics are produced or transhipped for the United States market. However, our immediate concerns are Belize, Bolivia, Peru and Mexico.

After several months of negotiation, the Government of Belize has not yet resumed aerial herbicidal eradication of marijuana, and we have informed Prime Minister Esquivel that we regard action against the crop that is now maturing at a record level of production as a critical test of his government's commitment to narcotics control.

The new government of President Paz Estenssoro has been very forthcoming in its early statements on the need for eradication of the extensive coca cultivation in Bolivia, and the enforcement actions in the Beni are the most encouraging developments in many months. The Paz Estenssoro government has also said it will need still more financial assistance, and has imposed austere financial conditions on its economy. We hope to see Bolivia progress in both economic reform and narcotics control, but we believe economic assistance must be tangibly linked to performance on narcotics control.

I participated in the very progressive meetings in August between Attorney General Meese and Mexican President de la Madrid and Attorney General Garcia Ramirez. Secretary Shultz, during the binational meetings held a few weeks before, stressed the overall importance the U.S. attaches to the problem of narcotics production and trafficking in Mexico. Attorney General Meese very ably underscored the United States view that narcotics control is the most important issue challenging our governments. Given the evidence of increased production of opium poppy and marijuana, the renewed commitments to cooperation on narcotics control by the Mexican Government are most welcome and essential. But, Mexico must regain control of the production issue and reverse the recent trend of increases.

We are encouraged by the statements made by new Peruvian President Alan Garcia concerning control of illicit coca production, by the enforcement gains from Operation Condor, and by the continuing manual eradication effort in the Upper Huallaga Valley, despite the also continuing violence perpetrated by narcotics traffickers and terrorists alike. But, the eradication effort must be extended to all of the growing regions in Peru, north and south, to stop the flow of coca paste to refineries in Peru and elsewhere.

Finally, the Committee asked whether control programs reduce supplies, or just result in shifts of production from one area to another. The answer is that control programs can and do reduce supply, albeit generally over a long period of time before reductions in source nations are matched by reductions in the United States, and, unless control programs are comprehensive and effected simultaneously in all key growing regions, the prospects for supply reduction are diminished.

History teaches us that, when the French Connection was broken, Mexican traffickers ultimately filled the void, until they too were displaced by the once highly effective Mexican control program, and then growers in Southwest and Southeast Asia provided new sources of opium and heroin. There has been a somewhat similar experience with marijuana, where Colombian and Jamaican traffickers profited after the effective eradication program was begun in Mexico.

More recently, we have seen important new cultivations of marijuana in Belize, Panama, Brazil and Venezuela. New coca plantations have been found in Brazil and Ecuador, and new cocaine laboratories in Argentina and even in the United States in the wake of the successful chemical control program that, with strong DEA assistance, has denied precursor chemicals to cocaine refiners. There have been some marginal attempts to cultivate opium poppy in South America, but our information indicates that this has not become a commercial factor.

Our awareness of this possibility occasions our taking a strong stand with Belize, in our assisting Panama this week in a spraying program, our new assistance to Brazil and Ecuador, and in numerous other ways in which we strive to keep pace with changes in production and trafficking patterns. We simply have to have the material and financial resources to cover this board. And again, our diplomatic initiative is vital here, because we do not believe that all of this programmatic expansion should be underwritten by the United States.

There has been good support by Italy, the United Kingdom and others, as well as the United States, for the Special

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Development and Enforcement Project in Pakistan, which could be further enhanced at a donors' meeting in October. This project is being managed by the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Through UNFDAC, there is also now an international presence in efforts to curb cocaine production in South America. Drawing largely on a $40 million pledge by Italy, the UN is designing projects for Colombia, Bolivia and Peru.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(GENERAL REVIEW OF PROGRAMS)

Because this is an oversight hearing, the Department has been asked to provide a review of programs. The following summaries are excerpted from the Mid-Year Update of the International Narcotics Control Strategy Report, which was submitted to Congress this week.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina. Federal police and customs authorities are reorganizing narcotics efforts as part of a new and more coordinated response to both internal and international narcotics trafficking challenges, especially the refining and trafficking in cocaine in the northern provinces.

Belize. The U.S. has maintained an active dialogue with the government of Prime Minister Esquivel since December, 1984, in which the U.S. has emphasized aerial herbicidal eradication as the key test of Belize's commitment to control its burgeoning cannabis crop. But, while repeatedly stressing its commitment to control narcotics trafficking and obtaining sought-for U.S. guidance on aerial eradication techniques, the Government of Belize has not yet (August 30) resumed herbicidal eradication of marijuana.

Bolivia. The new government (August) of President Paz Estenssoro inherited the severe economic problems and chronic instability that plagued earlier governments, but has pledged forceful, high priority action against narcotics trafficking. Bolivia continues as one of the two major sources of coca leaf for the world cocaine market (with Peru). The new government can draw upon an important May 1985 decree, which provides a broad mandate to restrict the production and marketing of illegal coca, to enhance 1985 activities, which include important raids and seizures but no eradication (through August). The Bolivians well understand the conditionality of continued U.S. assistance, especially the linkage to eradication.

Brazil. The new civilian government of President Sarney is assigning paramount priority to dealing with its socio-economic problems but, despite austerity measures, has also assigned a high priority to developing a comprehensive program of prevention and enforcement, including eradication of the increasing coca and marijuana cultivations. A new Federal Drug Council was established in July to make recommendations on policy and initiatives, and Brazilian Federal Police are continuing their aggressive enforcement and eradication activities, including major support commitments for Operation

Frederico III (coca) and Operation Satellite (marijuana). Brazilian police report destroying more than 981,000 coca bushes by the end of the first phase (ending August 20), with a second phase to begin later this month.

Colombia. The pace-setter in Latin America, Colombia is continuing its major marijuana eradication program, which could eliminate more than half of the 1985 crop, while continuing research on herbicides which will permit aerial eradication of coca bushes. The Colombians reported their all-time record for one month's eradication in July -- 1115 hectares of marijuana sprayed. Recent surveys (July) show that the highly effective 1984 marijuana eradication program discouraged new planting in some traditional areas, with many former fields abandoned. Although new cocaine refining sites are springing up in other South American countries, Colombia remains the principal refining source for cocaine exported to the U.S. and European markets. The National Police has intensified sweep operations, targeting traffickers, their boats and aircrafts, as well as lab sites, which have been destroyed along with scores of landing fields. Colombia extradited six persons to the U.S. on drug-related charges (the U.S. extradited one American), a major demonstration of its commitment to narcotics control under the Betancur Administration. By mid-year, Colombia was progressing well in its parallel program to cooperate and coordinate with neighboring countries, including an extradition agreement with Venzuela, a multi-nation radio network for enforcement agencies, a joint eradication campaign with Ecuador, and a successful cross-border interdiction campaign with Peru. By summer, Colombian and U.S. authorities were discussing several possible new initiatives to take maximum advantage of the destabilizing effects these various pressures were having on trafficker networks.

Costa Rica. The awareness of increasing cocaine shipments through Costa Rica, as well as the discovery of large-scale domestic marijuana cultivation, and the publicity on Mexican trafficker Caro Quintero's brief refuge in San Jose, have greatly increased the sensitivity of the public and law enforcement agencies to the need for narcotics control. In the last six months, 60 hectares of marijuana which could have yielded 120 tons of marijuana were destroyed.

Ecuador. The invigorated program begun by the Febres Cordero administration may set new records for eradication and interdiction in 1985. The campaign eradicated 230 hectares of coca in the first six months of 1985, and now includes a joint effort with Colombia. This joint effort has eradicated 66 hectares of coca in its first month of operation, while destroying 13 laboratories.

Mexico. The government has made major changes in its enforcement and security forces, including high-level personnel changes in the Federal Attorney General's office which is primarily responsible for narcotics eradication and enforcement. These changes were partly prompted by Mexico's fiscal austerity program, but also follow on renewed commitments by President de la Madrid to increase the operational effectiveness of the Mexican narcotics control program in the wake of the killing of U.S. DEA agent Camarena in February, and evidence of widespread official corruption, as well as increased production of opium and marijuana. Mexico continues to provide about one-third of U.S. heroin imports and an increasing share of marijuana imports, and has become a major transit route for cocaine. Three of the country's major traffickers were arrested in the post-Camarena investigation, and the reorganization of the narcotics control program includes commitments to U.S. assisted aerial surveys and aerial monitoring programs that should restore the effectiveness of the opium poppy and marijuana control campaigns. Attorney General Meese, Assistant Secretary Thomas and DEA Administrator Lawn met with the Mexican Attorney General and other officials in August to discuss means of strengthening cooperation.

Panama. The government has agreed to a spraying operation in September against marijuana cultivation which may exceed earlier estimates. Panama has also entered into negotiations with the U.S. on a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty, part of the U.S. effort to curb narcotics money laundering. There has also been cooperation on interdiction, resulting in several large seizures of narcotics and precursor chemicals.

Peru. Operation Condor, a successful ongoing effort with Colombian and U.S. enforcement agencies, is the first example of the commitment by new Peruvian President Alan Garcia to control narcotics production and trafficking in this Andean nation, one of two major sources for coca leaf that supplies the world cocaine market. By the end of August, more than 2400 kilos of cocaine base and paste had been seized, as well as chemicals and equipment. The government is also implementing an anti-corruption campaign. The new government has dismissed 37 police generals and is expected to remove more than 200 colonels and other officers. Coca eradication continued in the final months of the Belaunde government (January-July), despite renewed violence, but drug seizures were seriously limited when, because of terrorist activity, the government declared the Upper Huallaga Valley an emergency zone, and the Peruvian military limited narcotics enforcement operations.

Venezuela. President Lusinchi has continued his leadership in the anti-narcotics effort, internationally

through sponsorship of resolutions which are leading to consideration of a new international convention on narcotics trafficking, and nationally through a stepped-up campaign to improve enforcement. The enforcement effort includes creation of a 100-man narcotics unit in the National Guard and reorganization of the judicial police.

THE CARIBBEAN

Bahamas. The most significant U.S.-Bahamian joint effort to date was initiated this year as Operation Blue Lightning. Seizures of cocaine in the first six months totalled 4,332 pounds. There is considerable pressure on the Pindling government to take effective action, growing out of the months-long inquiry into official connections as well as the Bahamas' increasing cocaine addiction problem. The U.S. assisted Operation Bahamas continues to be effective; nearly 130 tons of marijuana and 3 tons of cocaine have been seized this year.

Jamaica. The Seaga government has made notable progress in the first six months of 1985 in its efforts to combat marijuana cultivation and drug trafficking. Reported eradication data indicate that more marijuana was eradicated in the last six months than in all of 1984. A spring aerial survey found considerably less marijuana cultivation than was expected; prior estimates of the spring crop may have been too high, but the data suggest the eradication program is beginning to have an effect. The fall eradication campaign begins in September and the USG will again assist in an aerial photographic survey of marijuana cultivation. Jamaican authorities, recently coordinated under a single new command structure, have arrested two major groups of traffickers while continuing to destroy airstrips used by narcotics traffickers and making several large seizures.

SOUTHWEST ASIA

India. There is continuing concern about the potentially dangerous growth of India's licit opium stockpile, as well as transhipments of heroin from Pakistan and Burma and the provision of precursor chemicals to heroin laboratories in the Golden Triangle. In response, the Gandhi government is setting up a new GCI enforcement agency, and plans to strengthen its control laws. Seizures of heroin have increased over 1984 and may set records.

Pakistan. While opium production remains well below its historic highs, and the Zia government is extending its opium ban into still further areas of the Northwest Frontier

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Province, Pakistan remains both an important producer of opium and a major processor/exporter of morphine base and refined heroin. There is considerable trafficking in opium from Afghanistan. Pakistan, severely affected by its increasingly large heroin addiction problem, has begun to improve its narcotics enforcement efforts; major seizures of opium and heroin were reported in the first half of 1985, along with some important heroin lab seizures.

Syria. U.S. authorities are not aware of any narcotics production in Syria, but trafficking through that country continues unabated. While the government is reporting a more extensive anti-narcotics effort than before, the Syrian military in Lebanon has no known links to the narcotics police and are believed to be involved in facilitating narcotics trafficking through Lebanon.

Turkey. The government continues to be effective in prohibiting diversion from its licit opium production, and has prepared a special police project designed to combat narcotics smuggling through Turkey's rugged eastern provinces.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Burma. The government's program to curb the world's largest illicit opium production is expected to be sharply enhanced this fall by a full-scale eradication program. Because insurgent groups, principally the Burma Communist Party and the Shan United Army, control much of the opium producing territory, the government plans to use aerial eradication methods to destroy the poppy. Production in 1985 also may decline as a result of bad weather in many areas. The government continues to mount military campaigns against the headquarters and refining facilities of trafficking groups.

Hong Kong. The Hong Kong Government continues to puruse its narcotics enforcement efforts vigorously. The recent decline in street prices could mean that more heroin is being exported but HFG officials say there is no evidence that heroin is being exported in significant quantities. A recent Supreme Court decision allows the HKG to extradite defendants in narcotics trafficking cases.

Indonesia. The government of President Subarto, which appears to be increasingly concerned about transiting narcotics traffic, expanding domestic marijuana production, and domestic heroin addiction, treats narcotics abuse and trafficking as long-term threats to social stability. The government announced in May a reorganization of the National Police Narcotics Command. A crack-down on traffickers and other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

violators has resulted in arrests of police officials involved in narcotics trafficking and stiff sentences, especially for heroin traffickers.

Laos. Little is known about narcotics production in Laos, where the government continues to maintain that illicit production and consumption are under control.

Malaysia. The government considers narcotics trafficking a threat to its national security and continues to promote narcotics control activities by the United Nations and fellow ASEAN members, while striving to maintain its aggressive narcotics interdiction efforts. Malaysia, concerned about the political will needed among its neighbors to curb trafficking, has launched a diplomatic initiative to encourage the leaders of other countries in the region to focus on this threat.

Philippines. The Government's marijuana eradication program had its greatest success to date in 1984, but cultivation remains widespread, and the Philippines is a marijuana source country for Southeast Asia, Japan, Australia and the United States.

Thailand. The final Thai assessment of its 1984-85 opium crop shows that a larger area was under cultivation, but less opium was produced due to unfavorable weather conditions and increased eradication operations by Thai government units. The Thai intend to expand the controlled village concept, in which villagers agree not to plant opium in exchange for economic assistance provided to their villages. Thailand also continues its marijuana eradication efforts, which destroyed 1900 tons of marijuana plants in the three months ending January 1985. Thai Ranger units continue their operations against traffickers on the border and have seized of major shipments.

AFRICA

Egypt. Opium and hashish continue to be shipped into Egypt from Lebanon and Pakistan, despite improved interdiction by the Egyptian government. Egypt remains a transit point for heroin shipments to third countries, and there is new concern that heroin laboratories may be established in Egypt.

Morocco. Narcotics cultivation remains a principal economic activity in some areas, especially hashish for export to Europe. Government narcotics control efforts center on exports. The Government is reluctant to confront cultivators who inhabit regions where, currently and historically, the Government has had great difficulty in exercising its full authority. Thus, the prospects are that production and abuse levels will remain stable for the near future.

Other Countries: As required by P.L. 86-164, this report is primarily concerned with the major producer countries where narcotics are cultivated or refined. However, the USG is also actively involved in investigating and in many cases assisting transit countries in curbing the smuggling of illicit narcotics. The USG is involved with several countries that are not discussed in the report, such as Haiti, Paraguay, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Guatemala and others.

The USG is also involved with other aspects of the narcotics trade, such as investigations of money laundering, and has pursued agreements on obtaining financial information, such as last year's agreement with the Cayman Islands.

And, the USG continues to monitor the suspected activities of government officials in various countries, and even of governments, including Cuba, Nicaragua and Bulgaria. There have been several recent, important contacts with the Bulgarians by State and DEA, seeking to remedy that situation in which government agencies and officials were reportedly involved with the narcotics trade.

And, around the globe, the Department continues to monitor reports of possible involvement by terrorist groups and other political insurgents, who may be using the narcotics trade to finance their activities, including weapons purchases.

End

BEST COPY AVAILABLE